

States and upheld by the Supreme Court would disappear under Democrats' legislation. The bill would also prevent States from restricting any particular method of abortion, no matter how barbaric the method, and the bill would make it essentially impossible to impose any meaningful restrictions at all on abortion in any stage of pregnancy, including after the point of fetal viability, when the baby can survive outside its mother.

The bill would also jeopardize doctors' and nurses' right to refuse to participate in abortions and specifically prevent them from having recourse under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to protect their conscience rights. It would put measures in place to ensure that any State pro-life law would face an uphill climb in the courtroom. In short, this legislation would make abortion on demand at any time, for essentially any reason, the law of the land in the United States.

I hope—I really do hope—that during debate on this measure the Democrats are not going to pretend that their proposed abortion law somehow represents the prevailing sentiment of the country—because it doesn't. The vast majority of Americans believe that there should be at least some restrictions on abortion.

Gallup has been polling on abortion for decades, and in all that time, the percentage of Americans who believe abortion should be legal under any circumstances has always remained under 35 percent. In fact, for most of the past several decades that number has remained squarely under 30 percent.

A strong majority of Americans support at least some restrictions on abortion. Furthermore, the Associated Press poll from this June found that 65 percent of Americans believe that abortion should generally be illegal in the second trimester, or from about 13 weeks of pregnancy, while a whopping 80 percent—80 percent—of Americans believe that abortion should generally be illegal in the third trimester.

And it is not surprising. Americans aren't dumb. And thanks to ultrasounds and scientific advances and plain old common sense, they know just how ridiculous it is to claim that unborn children are just blobs of tissue. Most people are well aware that an unborn baby with its own heartbeat and fingers and toes and DNA is, in fact, not a blob of tissue but a human being.

And most people believe that human beings deserve to be protected, even when they are small and weak and vulnerable—especially when they are small and weak and vulnerable. And so it doesn't surprise me in the least that 80 percent of the American people think abortion should generally be illegal in the third trimester, because I can't imagine anyone being comfortable with the idea of killing a baby who is not only, like any unborn baby, a human being worthy of protection, but who is actually old enough to survive outside of his or her mother.

And so, as I said, I really, really hope the Democrats are not going to pretend that they are representing the American people with this appalling legislation. They are not representing the American people. They are representing the radical abortion lobby, and the radical abortion lobby is terrified that, as it well knows, it does not have the majority of the American people on its side. And so it is relying on its Democrat allies to push for perhaps the most radical pro-abortion legislation ever considered.

The American people are better than this, and I would hope that the Democratic Party would be better than this. The Democratic Party has historically portrayed itself as the defender of the little guy. It is unfortunate that that doesn't extend to the littlest guys and girls among us: the unborn babies in danger of dying from abortion.

There are hundreds of thousands of abortions in the United States every year. That is hundreds of thousands of innocent human lives lost. Do we really need to remove even the most modest restrictions on abortion?

While, unfortunately, the vast majority of the Democratic Party is in the pocket of the radical abortion lobby, I hope that there are at least some—some House Democrats—out there who aren't comfortable with this bill in the Democratic Party's extreme abortion politics.

And I hope that these Democrats will stand up and oppose their party's abortion-on-demand legislation. This anti-life legislation is an abomination, and it should never, never make it out of the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 169, Lily Lawrence Batchelder, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Charles E. Schumer, Ron Wyden, Martin Heinrich, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, Raphael Warnock, Ben Ray Lujan, Gary C. Peters, Elizabeth Warren, Christopher Murphy, Patrick J. Leahy, Tammy Duckworth, Sheldon Whitehouse, Michael F. Bennet, Tim Kaine, Tammy Baldwin, Cory A. Booker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lily Lawrence Batchelder, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 370 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Cassidy	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	McConnell	Tillis
Cornyn	Menendez	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Crapo	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	Young

NAYS—35

Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 35.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lily Lawrence Batchelder, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 245, Jayme Ray White, of Washington, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Middle East, Labor, and Environment), with the rank of Ambassador.

Charles E. Schumer, Catherine Cortez Masto, Gary C. Peters, Elizabeth Warren, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Christopher A. Coons, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Martin Heinrich, Jon Ossoff, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jayme Ray White, of Washington, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Middle East, Labor, and Environment), with the rank of Ambassador, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 371 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Baldwin	Graham	Portman
Barrasso	Grassley	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Scott (SC)
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Lummis	Stabenow
Cassidy	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Thune
Coons	McConnell	Tillis
Cornyn	Menendez	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cramer	Moran	Warner
Crapo	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Ernst	Ossoff	Wicker
Fischer	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	Young

NAYS—20

Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Braun	Inhofe	Rubio
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Kennedy	Shelby
Daines	Lankford	Sullivan
Hagerty	Lee	Tuberville
Hawley	Marshall	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The yeas are 78, the nays are 20.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jayme Ray White, of Washington, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Middle East, Labor, and Environment), with the Rank of Ambassador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the votes in relation to the White and Pan nominations occur at 6:30 p.m. tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be one rollcall vote at 2:45 p.m. today. That vote will be on the confirmation of the Batchelder nomination. There will be two rollcall votes at 6:30 p.m. tonight. Those will be on the confirmation of the White nomination and cloture on the Pan nomination.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIALISM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, paraphrasing a philosopher of his era, Winston Churchill once said: Those that fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

And I doubt that Churchill was the only one that said that. I think we quote other people saying similar things.

Now, Churchill was himself a devoted student to history. The research for his multivolume biography of his ancestor, John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, likely informed his strategic military thinking as Prime Minister during World War II.

Churchill was also a fierce critic of socialism in his time, and that is the main point of my remarks today—talking about socialism.

Socialism, as we know it today, is based on a different view of history than what Churchill had, a history that says we are headed in a particular direction, and you just need to see where it is heading to “be on the right side of history.”

Socialism was thought to be the wave of the future in Churchill's time, just as it was the wave of the future when Karl Marx was writing about it in the mid-1800s. In fact, a wave is an apt analogy for socialism. Enthusiasm for socialism has crested and then crashed down many, many times in the last couple of centuries.

Today, some enthusiasts are again riding high on this socialism wave. Some of them are too young to know better, while others simply refuse to learn the lessons from the previous crashes that socialism has shown us.

Given previous spectacular failures of full-fledged socialism in Eastern Europe, Latin America, Asia, and Africa, usually, as we learn, resulting in violence, in poverty, and, most importantly, suppression of individual rights that we value here in the United States, but also advocates of socialism find themselves on the defensive once again.

When asked why we should try a system that has repeatedly and spectacularly failed, a common fallback is to cite Sweden and other Nordic countries as examples that we should learn from.

It may surprise some of my colleagues here in the Senate that this is one point where I agree with the socialists. We should examine and learn from Sweden's experience. In fact, an excellent summary of Sweden's experience from the 1950s to this very day has been compiled by the Swedish economist Johan Norberg. His video, which goes by the title “Sweden: Lessons for America,” is available on YouTube as part of the Free to Choose Network. A short paper similarly titled, “Sweden's Lesson for America,” has been published by the Cato Institute.

So I would recommend to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle paying attention to either that video or that publication by Cato because we can learn a lot from Sweden, and it is not what people will be espousing here in the U.S. Senate based upon a lot of political speeches from those on the left.

As Norberg points out, by about 1950, Sweden was the fourth richest country in the world and had the fifth freest economy. In other words, Sweden became wealthy through economic freedom, like we have here in America. And then, you know what, Sweden started to adopt socialist policies.

At first, it was just a few welfare programs. But between 1960 and 1980, government spending in Sweden doubled from 31 percent of gross domestic product to 60 percent of gross domestic product, and, of course, that meant for all the people in Sweden to pay sky-high taxes.

This is the time period that older socialists remember so fondly and we see espoused here on the Senate floor. Sweden was surfing on top of the socialist wave and seemed to have it all: prosperity, massive government spending, and a highly regulated economy. However, even the best surfers cannot ride a wave forever. All waves eventually come crashing down. Sweden's socialist policies started to kill off the wealth creation that had made its economy the fourth richest in the world. That wealth economy was needed to fund all that government spending.

Norberg points out that Sweden was 10 percent richer than the G7 countries on a per-capita basis in 1970. But 25 years later, 1995, it was more than 10 percent poorer than those same G7 countries. During that time, not a single job was created in Sweden's private sector, and, more importantly, inflation took away almost all of the value